

096665

20816



REPORT TO THE COMMITTEE
ON APPROPRIATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE

72-0126



11
13
19
36
2
10

Federal Manpower Training Programs 7
--GAO Conclusions And Observations

B-146879

Department of Labor
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare
Office of Economic Opportunity

BY THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES

~~700965~~ 096665

FEB. 17 1972



COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

B-146879

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

Dear Mr. Chairman:

This is a summary report of our conclusions and observations on Federal manpower training programs based on our reviews completed from 1969 through 1971.

We believe that the contents of this report would be of interest to other committees and members of the Congress. However, release of the report will be made only upon your agreement or upon public announcement by you concerning its contents.

Sincerely yours,

Comptroller General
of the United States

cl
R The Honorable Allen J. Ellender
Chairman, Committee on Appropriations^S 300
United States Senate

C o n t e n t s

| | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| DIGEST | 1 |
| CHAPTER | |
| 1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND ON MANPOWER TRAINING PROGRAMS | 5 |
| Manpower training programs | 6 |
| GAO reviews of manpower training programs | 8 |
| 2 DESCRIPTION OF MANPOWER PROGRAMS: THEIR FUNDING AND ADMINISTRATION | 11 |
| Funding and description of manpower programs | 13 |
| 3 SUMMARY OF GAO FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON MANPOWER PROGRAMS | 21 |
| Program design | 21 |
| Eligibility and screening | 25 |
| Counseling | 27 |
| Occupational and academic training | 29 |
| Job development and placement | 32 |
| Monitoring | 34 |
| Follow-up | 36 |
| Program planning | 38 |
| Supportive services | 41 |
| Management information systems | 42 |
| Fiscal and financial matters | 44 |
| 4 OVERALL OBSERVATIONS | 47 |
| How to measure success of programs | 47 |
| Proliferation of manpower training programs | 48 |
| Impact of the economy | 49 |
| Programs have limited impact in rural areas | 51 |
| APPENDIX | |
| I GAO reports to the Congress on civil agency manpower programs | 53 |

APPENDIX

Page

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| II | Department of Labor staffing for manpower programs | 54 |
| III | Funding and enrollment opportunities of Federal manpower programs | 56 |
| IV | Principal officials of the Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Economic Opportunity responsible for the administration of activities discussed in this report | 57 |

ABBREVIATIONS

| | |
|-------|--|
| AFDC | aid to families with dependent children |
| CAMPS | Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System |
| CEP | Concentrated Employment Program |
| EOA | Economic Opportunity Act |
| GAO | General Accounting Office |
| HEW | Department of Health, Education, and Welfare |
| JOBS | Jobs Opportunities in the Business Sector |
| MDTA | Manpower Development and Training Act |
| NYC | Neighborhood Youth Corps |
| OEO | Office of Economic Opportunity |
| OJT | on-the-job training |
| WIN | work incentive |

D I G E S T

WHY THE REVIEW WAS MADE

This report, prepared by the General Accounting Office (GAO) in response to a request by Senator Allen J. Ellender, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, contains background information on the principal manpower programs, and a summary of GAO's findings, conclusions, recommendations, and overall observations resulting from its reviews of manpower programs over the past 3 years.

The Department of Labor obligated over \$6 billion dollars for manpower training programs from fiscal year 1963 through fiscal year 1971. About 6 million persons were enrolled for training during that period. The Department's planned funding for such programs in fiscal year 1972 is about \$2.6 billion.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

A major GAO effort in the manpower training area was a review during 1968 and 1969 of antipoverty programs and activities authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. More recently GAO issued reports on the operations of the Manpower Development and Training Act, on-the-job and institutional training programs, the Job Opportunities in the Business Sector program, the Special Impact program, and the work incentive program.

GAO did not review the same aspects of manpower training programs at all locations. The findings discussed below therefore may not have been common to all the manpower programs GAO reviewed or even common to one program at various locations, but they are indicative of areas needing improvement.

Program design--Program design has a significant bearing on a program's potential for achieving statutory objectives. For example, GAO believes that the program design for the in-school and summer components of the Neighborhood Youth Corps involved too simplistic an approach to bring about any dramatic reduction in the dropout rates among high school students.

Also problems existed in the design of the Job Opportunities in the Business Sector program. It does not work well during periods of a declining economy when it is difficult to interest employers in manpower programs. The design of the work incentive program and the aid to families with dependent children program needs to be changed in certain respects if the overall objectives of providing encouragement and opportunities for employment is to be realized. (See p. 21.)

Eligibility and screening--Substantial numbers of persons enrolled in various manpower programs did not meet the eligibility criteria established by the Department of Labor or could not be identified readily by GAO as having met such criteria because the sponsors did not have enough information about program participants. (See p. 25.)

Counseling--Improved counseling services were needed to ensure that participants benefit from a program. Generally counseling was not conducted on a regularly scheduled basis, and records of counseling activities were not adequately maintained. (See p. 27.)

Occupational and academic training--A need existed to improve the quality and content of occupational and academic training given in a number of programs. For example, work assignments given to youths in the Neighborhood Youth Corps in-school, out-of-school, and summer components were directed almost entirely to providing these youths with work experience and work habits, as distinguished from training them in particular job skills. Also some program sponsors were not providing needed basic education. (See p. 29.)

Job development and placement--Enough appropriate jobs had not been developed for all Concentrated Employment Program enrollees. Also program sponsors of the Neighborhood Youth Corps out-of-school components generally did not provide the needed postenrollment services, such as exit interviews, placement in permanent employment, and referral to more advanced vocational training.

A significant number of the jobs provided by contractors under the Job Opportunities in the Business Sector program paid low wages and appeared to afford little or no opportunity for advancement. Often they were jobs that traditionally were filled with unskilled or low-skilled persons. (See p. 32.)

Monitoring--Effective and continuous monitoring of manpower programs by Federal representatives is essential to detect and correct program weaknesses, strengthen program administration, and better ensure achievement of program objectives. Many of the administrative weaknesses observed in a number of programs could have been corrected earlier through more effective monitoring efforts by the Department of Labor. (See p. 34.)

Follow-up--The Department of Labor or the program operators should develop information on the status of former trainees and if necessary provide them with follow-up services, such as additional training or placement. (See p. 36.)

Program planning--The Special Impact program in Los Angeles, California, was implemented hurriedly without the detailed planning and attention required to enhance the chances of its success and to protect the interests of the Government. It had fallen far short of accomplishing its objectives.

Little use was made of a training facility primarily because of a reduction in funding. Also the facility was not made available for use by other organizations. (See p. 38.)

Supportive services--Certain contractors in the Job Opportunities in the Business Sector program failed to provide trainees with supportive services, such as counseling, basic education, and health care, although such services were required by their contracts. Training allowances, which are intended as subsistence or incentive payments and which are determined in accordance with enabling legislation, varied considerably among four manpower programs in the Atlanta, Georgia, area. (See p. 41.)

Management information systems--Deficiencies existed in the management information systems for the work incentive program, the Job Opportunities in the Business Sector program, and the Concentrated Employment Program. (See p. 42.)

Fiscal and financial matters--GAO's reviews identified defects in the adequacy and exercise of controls over procurement and property management, payrolls and allowances, values assigned to non-Federal contributions, and auditing. (See p. 44.)

RECOMMENDATIONS OR SUGGESTIONS

C? GAO reported these findings to the Congress and to agency officials and made recommendations to improve the manpower programs.

AGENCY ACTIONS AND UNRESOLVED ISSUES

The agencies, in commenting on GAO findings (see ch. 3), indicated that they had taken or would take actions on most of GAO's recommendations. GAO has not made follow-up reviews to determine whether the actions promised have been taken or whether the actions taken have been effective in correcting the problems.

OVERALL OBSERVATIONS

In addition to reaching the conclusions and making the recommendations discussed above, GAO gained certain overall impressions about several aspects of manpower training which, GAO believes, warrant consideration in formulating programs and evaluating their results.

--Some manpower programs can be assessed only in subjective terms because they deal with intangible concepts, such as the social levels of disadvantaged persons, and are subject to conditions which are not readily measurable. Although the Department of Labor is working to improve its management information system, a problem still will remain in attempting to ascertain at what point--using measurable data--programs are effective. GAO believes that evaluations, despite their limits, are of value to program managers and should continue to be made. (See p. 47.)

- There has been a proliferation of manpower training programs, many of them specifically authorized in legislation and having their own funding source and eligibility requirements. Although some competition is healthy and desirable, duplication or overlapping can be counterproductive. For example, in one large eastern city 18 different organizations were involved in job development and placement activities. (See p. 48.)
- During periods of high or increasing unemployment, manpower training programs are not too successful in achieving their main objective--placing persons in jobs utilizing their new skills--because the abundance of unemployed trained workers offsets the benefits to the employers in hiring disadvantaged program participants. (See p. 49.)
- Manpower training programs face limited chances for success in rural areas where job opportunities are limited and where there is a general lack of economic growth. (See p. 51.)

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

ON MANPOWER TRAINING PROGRAMS

Since 1964 we have made numerous reviews of Department of Labor manpower training programs under both statutory and general audit authority. We have reviewed all the major manpower training programs and have issued reports to the Congress, to individual members and committees of the Congress, and to responsible agency officials.

A major effort in the manpower area was our review during 1968 and 1969 of antipoverty programs and activities authorized by the Economic Opportunity Act (EOA) of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2701). Our review included such manpower programs as the Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps (NYC), Concentrated Employment Program (CEP), and Work Experience and Training Program. The summary report on the overall review of antipoverty programs was submitted to the Congress in March 1969, and it was followed by reports on our reviews at specific locations. More recently we have prepared reports on the operations of the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA) (42 U.S.C. 2581) on-the-job and institutional training programs, the Job Opportunities in the Business Sector (JOBS) program, the Special Impact program, and the work incentive (WIN) program.

On July 12, 1971, the Chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations, requested us to investigate, review, and report to the Committee on the various manpower-training activities principally administered by the Department of Labor. In accordance with subsequent discussions with the Chairman's office, it was agreed that our report would include:

- A brief description of the principal manpower programs administered by the Department of Labor.
- Information on the funding and the responsibilities for administering each program.

--A summary of the findings we reported during the past 3 years in our reviews, the conclusions we drew from such findings, a summary of the recommendations we made, and information on the actions the agencies took to implement our recommendations.

--Any overall observations based on our review experience with manpower programs.

The agency actions described in this report for the most part are based on information furnished to us by the agencies. We have not made follow-up reviews to determine whether all the actions promised have been taken.

We provided a draft of this report to the Department of Labor in December 1971, and we considered the Department's informal comments in the preparation of this report.

MANPOWER TRAINING PROGRAMS

The primary objective of the Federal manpower training programs is to develop job skills and thereby help the unemployed and underemployed, particularly welfare recipients and other disadvantaged persons, to make the transition to better jobs, better pay, and higher level skills.

Authorized manpower activities include:

- Recruitment, counseling, testing, placement, and follow-up services.
- Classroom instruction in both remedial education and occupational skills.
- Training on the job with both public and private employers aided by manpower subsidies.
- Work experience and short-term employment for special age groups and those temporarily unemployed and transitional public service employment at all levels of government.

--Ancillary or supportive services, such as child-care assistance, relocation assistance, and minor health care or treatment.

Evolution of Federal
manpower training programs

The Federal Government's role in manpower training goes back many years. Certainly the GI bill (58 Stat. 287), under which millions of servicemen returning after World War II received some type of education or training that better enabled them to obtain profitable employment, qualified as a major manpower-training effort. Manpower training as a distinct program came into being during the 1960's and received its initial recognition in the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961 (42 U.S.C. 2501), which provided job-oriented training programs for unemployed and underemployed persons. The training programs were somewhat limited because (1) a relatively small amount of money was appropriated for them and (2) the act restricted training to persons who resided in areas designated as redevelopment areas on the basis of substantial and persistent unemployment or the low income of area residents.

MDTA was enacted in 1962 during a period of high unemployment, a growing labor force, and a widening impact of technological change upon employment. MDTA introduced a new concept into Federal efforts to help those without jobs and provided \$70 million in Federal funds (fiscal year 1963) to support institutional and on-the-job training. Responsibility for initiating the MDTA programs at the local level was delegated to the State employment security agencies (see p. 11), although the Department of Labor retained policy control.

Congressional debate on the act showed that its sponsors envisioned it as a program to retrain workers whose skills had become outmoded or had been replaced by automation and to channel the workers into emerging fields where appropriate skilled labor was scarce. MDTA was amended periodically from 1963 to 1968. The amendments expanded program coverage to unemployed, disadvantaged youth and older workers; provided for experimental and demonstration projects; authorized some ancillary or supportive programs;

and authorized a labor market information and job-matching program.

The second major enabling legislation for manpower programs was enacted 2 years after the passage of MDTA. EOA created a range of programs for poverty communities. In the manpower field the initial three programs of considerable significance resulting from the new legislation were the Job Corps, NYC, and the Work Experience and Training Program for welfare recipients.

The next major manpower bill was enacted in January 1968, as an amendment to the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 630). It authorized the WIN program to provide intensive "employability development" services for selected welfare recipients in the aid to families with dependent children (AFDC) category. The WIN program is the successor to the Work Experience and Training Program which was discontinued.

In July 1971 the President signed the Emergency Employment Act (85 Stat. 146), which provides for programs of public service employment for unemployed persons during times of high unemployment.

GAO REVIEWS OF MANPOWER TRAINING PROGRAMS

Since 1964 we have made various reviews of manpower programs under both general (the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (31 U.S.C. 53), and the Accounting and Auditing Act of 1950 (31 U.S.C. 67)) and specific audit authority. Between 1964 and 1967 we reported to the Congress on the administration and management of training under MDTA. Between 1967 and 1969 we reported to the Congress on improvements needed in (1) contracting for on-the-job training in the Los Angeles area, (2) program operations of NYC in Detroit, Michigan, and Los Angeles, and (3) activities of Job Corps centers in California, Florida, and Oregon.

Title II of the 1967 EOA amendments directed GAO to make a broad-scope review of programs and activities authorized by the act, to determine the efficiency of the administration of such programs and the extent to which the programs were achieving the objectives set forth in the act. The programs and activities included certain manpower

programs: Job Corps, NYC, CEP, Work Experience and Training Program, and locally initiated Community Action Program manpower programs.

Our summary report on the overall review of antipoverty programs was submitted to the Congress in March 1969. It was followed by 54 reports resulting from our reviews at specific locations and by five supplementary reports, prepared by our contractor, on special studies directed principally to evaluating the achievement of program objectives. Most of the 54 reports dealt with some aspects of manpower training.

The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, in reporting on the 1968 amendments to MDTA, urged us to broaden our evaluation of manpower programs to give the Congress the benefit of independent reviews of the performances of the executive agencies. In response we have made a number of reviews of Federal manpower programs and have issued reports to the Congress. The reports dealt with the Special Impact program in Los Angeles; the on-the-job training program in Appalachian Tennessee; the institutional training at the East Bay Skills Center in Oakland, California; the evaluation of the JOBS program in five cities; and the WIN program in Los Angeles and in Denver, Colorado; and the outreach and screening for manpower programs in the Atlanta area.

We have reviews in process on: CEP, NYC, and MDTA institutional programs in several geographical areas; Opportunities Industrialization Centers; Special Impact program; and local manpower activities supported or administered by selected Community Action Agencies.

A current major effort, which should continue until 1973, is an ongoing review and evaluation of public service employment under the Emergency Employment Act for the Chairman, Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower, and Poverty of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. This work will result in a series of reports on selected aspects of the program at various locations.

Our reviews generally are being directed toward evaluations of the results of program operations and the

identification of significant areas of weaknesses in program administration or concepts which require attention and action by either the administering agencies or the Congress.

CHAPTER 2

DESCRIPTION OF MANPOWER PROGRAMS:

THEIR FUNDING AND ADMINISTRATION

For more than 10 years, the Federal Government has been involved in manpower training through a number of programs involving many sponsors--public and private corporations, States, counties, and cities. As discussed in chapter 1, the prime responsibility for the administration of manpower training programs rests with the Department of Labor, but both the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO) and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW), are involved to varying degrees.

The Manpower Administration, under the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Manpower and Manpower Administrator, is responsible for providing the manpower-training services of the Department of Labor. The U.S. Training and Employment Service, the Unemployment Insurance Service, the Job Corps, and the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training serve as the focal points within the Manpower Administration for formulating policies and procedures for program development and operation.

As of September 30, 1971, the Manpower Administration had about 4,700 employees, 2,000 of whom were in Washington, D.C. Most of the day-to-day operations are carried out at 10 regional offices, which plan and provide for the operation of manpower training programs in the regions in partnership with other Federal, State, local, and private organizations. The Manpower Administration regional offices had about 1,750 employees at September 30, 1971. (The remaining 950 employees were in the District of Columbia Manpower Administration and in the field offices of the Veterans Employment Service and the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training). Total payroll costs for the Manpower Administration for fiscal year 1972 were budgeted at \$60.5 million.

The Federal-State employment security program encompasses two major programs: (1) employment service--a nationwide network of public employment offices that find jobs for

persons and persons for jobs--and (2) unemployment insurance-- a method of providing payments to insured workers during periods of unemployment. Through Federal grants, the States operate over 2,300 offices of State employment services. Each employment service office is responsible for carrying out the authorized functions related to the employment and specialized manpower programs in its community or local area. This includes recruiting, screening, counseling, referring applicants for training programs, paying training allowances, and assisting trained persons in finding training-related employment.

The Bureau of Adult, Vocational, and Technical Education, Office of Education, is the focal point within HEW for carrying out the responsibilities of the Secretary of HEW for providing training under MDTA. HEW manages the MDTA program through its Washington, D.C., headquarters office and through 10 regional offices. HEW budgeted 159 positions for MDTA in fiscal year 1972, 112 in Washington and 47 in the field, at a total payroll cost of \$2 million.

Appendix II contains detailed information on Manpower Administration personnel who work on manpower programs.

FUNDING AND DESCRIPTION OF MANPOWER PROGRAMS

The Department of Labor obligated over \$6 billion for manpower training programs from fiscal year 1963 through fiscal year 1971. About 6 million persons were enrolled for training during that period. For fiscal year 1972 the planned Department of Labor funding for such programs is about \$2.6 billion, including \$1 billion for programs under the Emergency Employment Act. In addition, HEW has budgeted \$78 million for child care to be provided under the WIN program and \$6.9 million for Opportunities Industrialization Centers. Also OEO has budgeted \$6 million for Opportunities Industrialization Centers and \$25.8 million for the Special Impact program.

From fiscal year 1965 through fiscal year 1970, funding for major manpower training programs was provided to both the Department of Labor and OEO. Beginning in fiscal year 1971, the following training programs authorized by EOA were funded through direct appropriation to the Department of Labor: JOBS program, CEP, Public Service Careers Program, NYC, Job Corps, and Operation Mainstream.

The estimated fiscal year 1972 funding for the major manpower training programs administered by the Department of Labor follows.

| | Estimated fiscal year 1972 funding (000 omitted) |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Manpower Development and Training | |
| Act--institutional training | \$ 324,800 |
| On-the-job training | 60,500 |
| Job Corps | 197,200 |
| NYC | 362,500 |
| Operation Mainstream | 38,800 |
| CEP | 172,800 |
| JOBS program | 200,000 |
| Public Service Careers Program | 125,800 |
| WIN program | 197,100 |
| Emergency Employment Act | <u>1,000,000</u> |
| | <u>\$2,679,500</u> |

A detailed breakdown of estimated obligations and enrollment opportunities for fiscal year 1972 is shown in appendix III. The appendix also includes information on the funding of \$607.5 million for program support, job banks, Special Impact programs, and other programs.

Following are brief descriptions of the objectives and main emphases of principal Department of Labor, HEW, and OEO manpower programs and activities. Some programs are specifically authorized by name in the enabling legislation; others are not specifically named but have been implemented pursuant to the authority contained in the law. The legislative authority under which each program operates is shown below in parentheses.

MDTA

The MDTA institutional training program (title II of MDTA) provides--through grants--classroom occupational training and related supportive services for unemployed persons 16 years of age and older who cannot reasonably be expected to obtain full-time employment with their present skills and for underemployed persons who are working but who, with training, could obtain higher level employment.

Training relevant to the local labor market, as determined by the State employment service, usually is provided in skills centers or in public or private vocational schools. The training courses are developed and carried out jointly by the local employment service office and vocational education agency, in coordination with their Federal counterparts in the Department of Labor and HEW. Of the funds for institutional training and on-the-job training programs (see below), 80 percent is apportioned to the States using a formula which reflects the severity of unemployment in the States as well as other factors which are prescribed by the act.

OJT

On-the-job training (OJT) programs (title II of MDTA) provide occupational training for unemployed and underemployed persons who cannot reasonably obtain appropriate full-time employment without MDTA assistance. Such training generally is conducted through private industry--local employers; national groups, such as union organizations; or nonprofit organizations--in the regular work environment. The private firms are reimbursed by the Federal Government

either directly or through the State for certain costs of instruction, materials, and other expenses related to training. The trainees are on the payrolls of the employers.

The Job Corps (title I, pt. A of EOA) is a national program designed to serve those disadvantaged young men and women aged 14 to 21; to train enrollees to become productive citizens; to place terminated corps members in jobs, other training programs, secondary schools or colleges, or the Armed Forces; to test, develop, and disseminate new techniques for working with disadvantaged youths that will improve the capability of the Job Corps and other institutions training disadvantaged youth. Job
Corps

The program has residential urban and rural conservation centers and has nonresidential centers which serve as skill training centers but permit the youths to remain in or near their home communities. Job Corps centers are run by State and Federal agencies, private industry, and public agencies or nonprofit agencies having the capabilities to carry out the objectives of the program. As of October 1971 there were 34 civilian conservation centers, 16 urban centers, and 15 residential manpower and residential support centers in operation. Functions of the Job Corps were delegated by OEO to the Department of Labor in July 1969.

NYC (secs. 123a(1) and (2), title IB of EOA) provides opportunities to students of low-income families to earn sufficient funds to remain in school while receiving useful work experience and some supportive services and provides work experience training and supportive services for youths from low-income families who have dropped out of school. NYC

The program has three major components: (1) an in-school program which provides part-time work for students of high school age from low-income families, (2) a summer program which provides such students with job opportunities during the summer months, and (3) an out-of-school program which provides economically deprived school dropouts who are 16 to 17 years of age (10 percent may be enrolled at 18 and 19 years of age) with practical work experience and on-the-job training to encourage them to return to school and resume their education or, if this is not feasible, to help them acquire skills that will improve their employability.

Enrollees work an average 26 hours a week during the summer and 8 to 15 hours a week during the school year at a minimum wage of \$1.60 an hour. Projects are sponsored by State and local public nonprofit agencies, including public schools and Community Action Agencies. Administrative authority was delegated by OEO to the Department of Labor in October 1964.

*Operation
Mainstream* Operation Mainstream (sec. 123a(3), title IB and sec. 162a(1), title IE of EOA) provides work-training and employment activities, with necessary supportive services, for chronically unemployed needy adults who have poor employment prospects and who are unable--because of age, lack of employment opportunity, or otherwise--to secure appropriate employment or training assistance under other programs. Participants must be 22 years of age or older; however, 40 percent of enrollment must be adults 55 years of age or older.

Job opportunities may involve the management, development, and conservation of parks, highways, and recreational areas of Federal, State, and local governments; the improvement and rehabilitation of other community facilities; and the provision of social, health, and educational services to the poor. Administrative authority was delegated by OEO to the Department of Labor in March 1967.

CEP CEP (sec. 123a(5), title IB of EOA) is a system of packaging and delivering manpower services in a clearly defined geographical area. Working through a single contract with a single sponsor (usually a Community Action Agency), the Manpower Administration provides a flexible package of manpower programs, including outreach and recruitment; orientation; counseling and job coaching; basic education; various medical, day-care, and other supportive services; work-experience or vocational training under a variety of manpower programs; job development and placement; and individualized follow-up after placement. Manpower employability and training services are provided only to disadvantaged residents of the locally defined CEP area. As of December 1971 there were 69 urban and 13 rural CEPs.

Job Bank The Job Bank Program (title I of MDTA) provides, through the use of automatic data processing procedures and

equipment, maximum exposure of job openings on a current basis to applicants seeking work in a public employment service office or in participating agency office in a city where a job bank is operating. The program is run through the State employment security agencies as part of their total program of employment services provided to individual applicants. As of September 1971 job banks were in operation in 100 metropolitan areas.

The JOBS program (title II of MDTA; title IB of EOA) is directed to persons who are classified as disadvantaged and who need on-the-job training and such various supportive services as health care and counseling to enable them to become productive workers. The program was founded on the premise that immediate placement in jobs at regular wages, followed by on-the-job training and supportive services, would provide superior motivation for disadvantaged persons. The Department of Labor, in cooperation with the National Alliance of Businessmen, provides technical assistance and encouragement to employers.

JOBS

The program consists of a contract component and a noncontract, or voluntary, component. Under the contract component, private employers enter into contracts with the Department of Labor either individually or in groups--consortiums--for the employment and training of disadvantaged persons. The contracts provide for the payment of the extraordinary costs in hiring, training, and retaining disadvantaged persons. Under the noncontract component, private employers pledge to hire specific numbers of disadvantaged persons without any cost to the Government. Noncontract employers are not subject to the same Government restrictions, controls, and reporting requirements as contract employers.

The Public Service Careers Program (secs. 123 and 127, title IB of EOA; sec. 102, title I of MDTA) provides on-the-job training and supportive services to enable disadvantaged persons to qualify for jobs with Federal, State, and local governments; private nonprofit agencies; and agencies that receive Federal grants-in-aid. Unemployed or underemployed persons 18 years of age or older are eligible for the program.

Public Service
Careers Program

The Public Service Careers Program, administered by the Department of Labor, includes the New Careers program which was authorized by an EOA amendment and subsequently delegated by OEO to the Department of Labor in March 1967.

WIN
The WIN program (title II of the Social Security Amendments of 1967) is designed to provide certain recipients of assistance under the AFDC program with training opportunities and with such supportive services as are necessary to move them from welfare dependency to economic self-sufficiency through meaningful jobs. The WIN program is administered at the Federal level jointly by the Department of Labor and HEW. In each State the State employment service, under contract with the Department of Labor, is the prime manpower sponsor for the WIN program. State and local welfare agencies are responsible for referring AFDC recipients who qualify for the WIN program to nearby State employment service offices for enrollment in the program and for providing welfare supportive services.

changed by Tolmadye Amendment

OIC
The Opportunities Industrialization Centers program (sec. 222(a), title II of EOA; title II of MDTA) is somewhat unique among federally supported manpower training programs in that it was started by a group of private citizens without Federal funding. The first center, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, was developed by a group of ministers with funds from the community and from a philanthropic foundation.

The program emphasizes minority-group leadership and seeks to attract unemployed and underemployed persons who ordinarily have not been attracted to public agency-sponsored manpower programs. Under the program these persons are given motivational and basic work orientation, basic education, skills training, and job placement assistance. The program is funded largely by the Department of Labor, HEW, and OEO, although the Departments of Commerce and of Housing and Urban Development also provide funds. As of July 1971, 68 centers were in operation--62 of which were federally funded.

SIP
The Special Impact program (title ID of EOA) promotes community-based economic development as a means of making a measurable impact upon chronic unemployment and

underemployment and of developing entrepreneurial skills in urban areas having high concentrations of poverty and in rural areas having high outmigration. The program consists of experimental projects designed to test whether locally controlled community organizations, in partnership with established businesses, can produce effective programs of economic development in poverty areas.

The program provides funds for a variety of investment ventures which create jobs for poverty area residents and which create opportunities for the residents to participate in the ownership and management of community development corporations. Sponsors of the program are nonprofit community corporations made up of representatives of the area where development is to take place. Enrollees are disadvantaged persons in the area.

OEO delegated administrative responsibility for the Special Impact program to the Departments of Labor, Agriculture, and Commerce during fiscal years 1967 through 1969. Beginning in fiscal year 1970, OEO assumed responsibility for administering certain ongoing Special Impact programs and for all future programs.

The Emergency Employment Act of 1971, administered by the Department of Labor, seeks to alleviate recent high unemployment by providing funds to State and local governments in a 2-year program to hire an estimated 150,000 to 200,000 unemployed or underemployed persons for public service jobs. The jobs are to be transitional in nature, and the participants are to move to regular jobs as soon as practicable. The Federal Government pays 90 percent of the cost of carrying out the program. The remaining 10 percent must be contributed by the participating governmental units--Federal, State, and local governments; their subdivisions or institutions; and Indian tribes on Federal or State reservations. Funds are used primarily to pay wages and employment benefits to the persons employed.

EEA

The Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS) (title II of MDTA; Executive Order No. 11422, dated August 15, 1968) is designed to achieve interagency coordination in the planning and execution of all federally supported manpower training and supportive manpower services

CAMPS

programs. It is national in scope and provides all agencies concerned with manpower with opportunities to engage in dialogues on manpower and related problems and activities and on their programs' impact on agreed-upon goals.

CAMPS provides for a systematic planning of manpower needs and program resources at the national, regional, State, and local levels. A comprehensive manpower plan is developed that sets forth the needs of each State and its subdivisions and correlates those needs with the capabilities of the Federal agencies to meet these needs. Leadership is provided by the Department of Labor, and participating agencies include HEW; the Department of Agriculture; the Department of Housing and Urban Development; OEO; the Department of the Interior; the Department of Commerce; and the Civil Service Commission.

CHAPTER 3

SUMMARY OF GAO FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON MANPOWER PROGRAMS

Over the past several years, we have reviewed all the major manpower training programs in varying depths and have issued numerous reports to the Congress, to individual members and committees of the Congress, and to agency officials.

As our reviews have been concerned with selected components of the operation of the specific programs and as we normally do not review the same components on each program at all locations, the findings discussed below may not have been common to all the manpower programs or common to one program under way at various locations throughout the country. Our findings are indicative, however, of areas which needed improvement so that the Federal manpower effort can make a more significant contribution toward improving the Nation's economic and social life.

The areas which needed improvement fell into 11 major categories: program design, eligibility and screening, counseling, occupational and academic training, job development and placement, monitoring, follow-up, program planning, supportive services, management information systems, and fiscal and financial matters. The remainder of this chapter principally deals with the findings in these major areas contained in eight GAO reports issued to the Congress between January 1969 and January 1972. (See app. I for a listing of the reports.)

PROGRAM DESIGN

Program design problems have a significant bearing on a program's potential for achieving its statutory objectives.

We have noted design problems in various manpower programs. For example, our assessment of the in-school and summer components of the NYC program was made on the premise that the main purpose of these components was to assist youths from low-income families to remain in high school

until they graduated by providing them with earnings from part-time employment and that a collateral but secondary purpose was to provide the youths with on-the-job training and useful work experience and thereby enhance their later chances for employment.

On the basis of the work we performed, it appeared to us that the in-school and summer components of the NYC program had not had any significant effect on reducing dropouts among high school students. We found at a number of locations, particularly in urban areas, that school dropout rates had increased over the years and that the enrollment of considerable numbers of youths in the in-school and summer components of the NYC program apparently had done little to alter the trend.

The relative ineffectiveness of the NYC program seemed to result because, given the complex nature of the dropout problems and the variety of social and personal factors causing dropout, the concept of the NYC program involved too simplistic an approach to bring about any dramatic results. Certain officials advised us that the increase in the dropout rate was caused by a number of factors over which the NYC program generally had no control, such as (1) weaknesses in the educational system causing student disinterest and (2) unfavorable home environment. Another factor cited was that it was very likely that many (3) potential dropouts could not be enrolled in the NYC program because they would not qualify under established poverty-income criteria.

Various officials expressed the view that the NYC program, as it had been constituted, could not have had a significant impact on minimizing dropouts because the program prescribed a predominantly economic solution for a problem that required a broader range of preventive actions. Other officials disagreed, stating that economic deprivation was an important factor in youths' dropping out of school.

The NYC out-of-school component had not succeeded in providing work training in conformity with expressed legislative intent. We questioned the need for retaining the out-of-school component as a separate entity. The objective of this component seemed to be encompassed in other existing programs, particularly MDTA, with which it could be merged.

The JOBS program, initiated during a period of high employment, does not work well during periods of high or increasing unemployment. A basic concept of the JOBS program is that it is in the public interest to increase the supply of trained labor by reimbursing private business organizations for the cost of hiring, training, and retaining disadvantaged persons whom they otherwise would not have hired. A major problem with this concept is that the successful placement of such persons depends on labor demand. During periods of declining economy, it becomes increasingly difficult to interest employers in a manpower program for the disadvantaged. (See p. 49.)

The design of the WIN and the AFDC programs needs to be changed in certain respects if the overall objective of providing encouragement and opportunities to AFDC family heads to seek employment is to be realized. We noted, on the basis of our review in two cities, that, under the law and implementing regulations:

1. AFDC payments were discontinued to AFDC fathers when they obtained full-time employment, regardless of their wages. Frequently, because their net earnings from employment were less, or not significantly more, than the AFDC payments, the AFDC fathers were discouraged from holding or seeking employment.
2. AFDC mothers continued to receive welfare payments beyond the point at which they achieved income parity with persons not on welfare. For example, in Los Angeles a mother with three children could continue to receive payments, plus food stamps and free medical and dental care for herself and her children, until her earnings exceeded \$12,888 a year.
3. Funding restrictions imposed by the legislation authorizing the WIN program severely limited the implementation of the special work projects provided for in the law, which would have created jobs for AFDC recipients who were not qualified for regular WIN program training or job placement programs.

- - - -

In the area of program design, we recommended that the Congress consider

- redefining and clarifying the purposes and intended objectives of the NYC in-school and summer components and establishing specific and realistic goals for the programs,
- merging the out-of-school component with the MDTA program, and
- changing the designs of the WIN and AFDC programs to make the programs more equitable to all participants.

Although legislative changes to the NYC programs have not been made, the Department of Labor announced in January 1970 a change in the out-of-school component, one element of which would limit new enrollments to 16- and 17-year-old disadvantaged youths. This change has had the effect of forcing older youths to seek other training programs.

In December 1971 the Congress passed amendments to the Social Security Act that made certain changes in the design of the WIN program.

ELIGIBILITY AND SCREENING

Substantial numbers of persons enrolled in various manpower programs did not meet the established eligibility criteria of the Department of Labor or could not be identified readily by us as having met such criteria because the sponsors had not elicited sufficient information from program participants upon which to make sound determinations of eligibility. The eligibility criteria for the programs varied but generally required positive determinations that the applicant's family income was below the poverty level; the applicant had limited job opportunities; the applicant's age was within a certain range; and the applicant was a school dropout, was handicapped, or had special obstacles to employment (e.g., members of minority groups, former workers in declining industries, etc.).

Increased efforts were needed in the screening of applicants for the CEP, NYC, Job Corps, MDTA-OJT, and JOBS programs to ensure that only those persons for whom the programs were intended were enrolled. The enrollment of ineligible youths in the CEP, NYC, and Job Corps programs seemed to result primarily from laxity on the part of sponsors to adhere to eligibility criteria. Also in the CEP and NYC programs, the sponsors' files, in many instances, did not contain sufficient information for us to ascertain whether enrollees were eligible. The Department's policy in the JOBS program did not provide for any verification of statements by an applicant regarding his eligibility for enrollment in the program.

We noted that persons referred to the East Bay Skills Center under MDTA frequently did not meet the MDTA enrollment criteria that a person be in need of training to obtain employment. Some trainees were physically or emotionally handicapped and should have been referred to programs designed to overcome their particular problems, rather than to training programs for which they were not suited, and some appeared to have possessed, at the time they were referred for training, sufficient skills to obtain employment without training.

Concerning the JOBS program we noted that the Department's definition of the disadvantaged segment of the

population was far too broad and encompassed many persons who had no clear and legitimate need for assistance. Many persons enrolled in the program under the eligibility criteria appeared to us to require only placement assistance and not the costly on-the-job training and supportive services that were also integral parts of the program.

We believe that a prerequisite to a fully effective manpower program is the establishment and enforcement of appropriate eligibility criteria to ensure that the limited resources available are directed to the primary target group.

- - - -

We recommended to the Department of Labor that, to improve the effectiveness of manpower programs, the Department (1) emphasize to the appropriate State and private agencies which operate manpower programs the importance of proper selective screening to determine eligible program enrollees and (2) redefine the parameters of the disadvantaged segment of the population and focus the program resources on those persons who are not job-ready.

The Department noted that it had taken steps to ensure more adequate procedures for screening prospective trainees and agreed that an additional job-readiness determination should be added to the basic eligibility requirements.

COUNSELING

Counseling services needed to be improved, to ensure that all the benefits of the training programs accrue to the participants. Generally counseling was not conducted on a regularly scheduled basis and records of counseling activities were not adequately maintained.

Counseling services are those activities which complement instruction by assisting the trainee to plan for a vocational and/or educational objective; to examine and evaluate his personal, interpersonal, and social functioning; and to determine those personal characteristics which contribute to or impede his progress toward ultimate employment.

Counseling services provided to NYC and Job Corps enrollees need to be improved. No counseling services were provided to some of these youths, while the counseling services provided to others did not meet the prescribed minimum standards as to diversity, frequency, and quality. At the East Bay Skills Center only limited counseling was provided to trainees; most trainees were counseled slightly more than once a month. Also records frequently were not maintained on the counseling that had been provided.

All trainees needed to be provided with counseling services in a planned and systematic manner, to help identify trainees' problems and to enhance their potential for obtaining and retaining employment. This is particularly essential when dealing with persons from the disadvantaged segment of society who need special help. Counseling contacts should be documented adequately, to enhance the counselors' ability to recall pertinent information, to facilitate follow-up counseling, to enable program operators to better evaluate counseling activities, and to enable continuity of counseling in cases of counselor turnover.

- - - -

We recommended to the Department of Labor, OEO, and HEW that they institute procedures directed to improving the supervision and counseling of enrollees. The Department of Labor advised us that steps were being taken by the Department and the sponsors to improve the supervision and

counseling of enrollees and to monitor these activities. HEW concurred with our recommendations and stated that appropriate guidelines in this area were in the process of compilation. OEO agreed with our recommendations and said that it had taken or would take corrective actions.

OCCUPATIONAL AND ACADEMIC TRAINING

Basic elements of manpower programs are occupational and academic training. We found that occupational and academic training needed improvement in a number of programs.

The Department of Labor needed to substantially improve certain aspects of on-the-job training in an MDTA program in Appalachian Tennessee. Most of the firms visited by us were not providing, contrary to requirements, any training beyond that normally provided to new employees or generally were not hiring for training persons having any qualifications different from those of persons normally hired. Under this program, training is supposed to be provided for those unemployed persons who could not be expected to secure employment without such training.

Under these circumstances we concluded that nothing of significance was being accomplished by the program. Federal funds were dissipated that could have been used in productive on-the-job training activities.

Work assignments given to youths in the NYC in-school and summer components almost entirely were directed to providing these youths with work experience and good work habits, as distinguished from training them in particular job skills. The value of such work experience to the enrollees appeared to be worthwhile for the most part. There has been a broad presumption, on the part of the Department of Labor and sponsor officials, that work experience is beneficial to youths generally and that it enhances their future employment potential.

With regard to education and job-training efforts within the NYC out-of-school component, we found again, as we did with the in-school and summer components, that program emphasis had been on providing work experience and good work habits to the enrollees rather than on providing training in specific job skills. For example, in many of the cases we observed, work training provided to enrollees involved menial tasks, such as custodial and cleaning work in buildings, and general labor or maintenance type of activities.

We found in 1968 that Job Corps conservation centers generally provided vocational training through the performance of conservation work projects but little or no related vocational classroom instruction. We recognized the value of conservation work in itself. We recognized also that most of the centers had some work projects which permitted exposure to some occupational skills and that generally work projects were good vehicles for instilling proper work habits in corps members. The work projects we reviewed, however, generally did not offer intensive vocational training, nor were they directed toward skill development in occupational areas above the helper or laborer categories.

The academic programs at Job Corps urban centers were structured to provide the corps members with the reading and mathematical skills necessary for employment in the areas of their vocational training. In recognition that certain levels of academic achievement were essential to successful performance in various occupational areas, the centers generally established minimum academic requirements that were to be attained by the corps member either prior to his entering a specific vocational training program or by the time of his completing that program. Most of the centers we reviewed generally did not enforce the requirements, however, and, as a result, many corps members had not reached these academic levels by the time they had graduated from Job Corps.

Youths enrolled in the NYC out-of-school component chiefly were school dropouts who had difficulties competing for and holding permanent jobs because they generally lacked sufficient basic education. The need to provide such youths with additional basic education is recognized in legislation governing the NYC program. Program sponsors generally made little effort to assess enrollees' educational needs or to motivate the enrollees to participate in available educational programs. In addition, some sponsors generally did not make the necessary arrangements to provide educational classes for enrollees in basic skills, such as reading, writing, and arithmetic. As a consequence few enrollees participated in any form of remedial or supplemental educational curricula while enrolled in the program.

- - - -

We recommended to the Department of Labor and OEO that they take steps to improve the occupational and academic training within manpower programs. These agencies said that generally they were aware of these problems and would take, or had taken, actions. The Department of Labor told us in December 1971 that, under new NYC contracts, emphasis was being placed on training in specific job skills.

JOB DEVELOPMENT AND PLACEMENT

Job development--the identification of those employers who normally have job openings in occupations requiring the skills taught in training courses--and job placement--the process of placing a graduate in a suitable job in his chosen field--are the payoffs for manpower training. The job development and related placement services of several programs needed to be intensified so that enrollees have opportunities to obtain suitable jobs.

We noted that:

- Appropriate jobs had not been developed in sufficient number for CEP enrollees in four cities in which we made our review. Such factors as location of the jobs and related transportation problems, level of employer qualification requirements for job applicants, and adequacy of salaries offered often limited the filling of jobs that were available.
- Program sponsors of the NYC out-of-school components generally did not provide the needed postenrollment services to enrollees, such as exit interviews, placement in permanent employment for those eligible, and referral to more advanced vocational training. The sponsors' failure to adequately coordinate and establish working relationships with local State employment services appeared to be the cause of poor postenrollment services. Adequate postenrollment services are essential to identify youths who need further assistance.
- A significant number of the jobs provided by contractors under the JOBS program paid low wages and appeared to afford little or no opportunity for advancement; often they were the types of jobs that traditionally were filled with unskilled or low-skilled persons. This condition appeared to have been caused, in substantial part, by the lack of appropriate departmental guidelines defining the elements of meaningful employment for use by JOBS program administrators.

- - - -

We recommended that the Department of Labor take action to ensure that adequate job development and placement into meaningful jobs is carried out by program sponsors. The Department agreed to take appropriate action. The Department told us in December 1971 that an occupational opportunities rating system for the JOBS program, which was initiated in the summer of 1970, had provided appropriate guidelines which should help to correct this problem.

MONITORING

Effective and continuous monitoring of manpower programs by Federal representatives is essential to detect and correct program weaknesses, strengthen program administration, and better ensure achievement of program objectives. We found that:

- The Department's monitoring of Special Impact program contractors in Los Angeles appeared to us to have been inadequate during the critical early stages of the program. Visits to contractors by Department representatives to monitor contract performance, review and appraise report procedures, review enrollee satisfaction, and review overall effectiveness were made infrequently.
- Many of the weaknesses which we found in the administration of the CEP and NYC programs could have been corrected earlier or prevented through more effective monitoring efforts by the Department's field representatives. The field representatives had made very few onsite reviews of NYC sponsor operations, and the reviews that had been made generally consisted of inquiries into administrative details rather than of analyses of the sponsors' effectiveness in meeting program objectives.
- At the East Bay Skills Center, weaknesses in administration concerning such things as selection of persons for training, counseling, and follow-up activities could have been identified and possibly corrected earlier through more appropriate and timely monitoring of training operations.
- The Department's monitoring of the operations of JOBS program contractors needed to be greatly strengthened to ensure that the many contractors participating in the program would perform in accordance with their contract requirements. Some of the problems in the operation of the JOBS program that might have been dealt with, had the program been adequately monitored, were the contractors' (1) inability to meet specific hiring goals, which resulted in the obligation of program funds that were not used

subsequently or that were not used timely, (2) failure to provide required on-the-job training and related supportive services, and (3) submission of incorrect invoices, which resulted in overpayments by the Department of Labor.

- - - -

We recommended that the Department of Labor and HEW provide for more effective monitoring of manpower programs and training centers. Both Departments agreed on the need for more frequent and better monitoring, but they cited staff shortages as the reason for the inadequacies. The Department of Labor told us in December 1971 that it and HEW were in the process of setting up a joint monitoring system to be handled by the States.

FOLLOW-UP

There has been a need for the local employment service or the program sponsors to develop information on the status of former trainees and to provide these former trainees with follow-up services, such as additional training and placement services.

Under the MDTA program local employment service offices are expected to maintain contact with trainees and their employers after completion of training. The program handbook recognizes that the trainees may require additional services after training and calls for the local offices to provide such services as counseling and placement. Under other manpower programs Department of Labor guidelines require program sponsors to make provisions for follow-up of terminated enrollees.

At four locations the lack of follow-up information made it difficult for us to assess the effectiveness of CEP in helping enrollees obtain and retain employment. Limited staff appeared to be the primary cause.

Generally the Job Corps did not require centers to obtain periodic follow-up information on terminated corps members but, instead, relied on data from a sampling of terminated corps members obtained by an independent firm under contract to the Job Corps. The resulting data, although useful to the Job Corps in considering its overall program, generally was not of a nature to provide meaningful data on specific centers. It appeared that a periodic follow-up system for each of the centers would provide both the centers and the Job Corps with useful data for evaluating the effectiveness of programs at specific centers and for providing a basis for determining whether further assistance might be needed by terminees.

At most locations the NYC sponsors generally did not provide the needed follow-up services to enrollees. Also those sponsors who provided the services did not maintain adequate records showing the extent of such services. Local program officials attributed the poor follow-up to the lack of sufficient staff and to limited funds.

The local State employment service offices serving the program's sponsors for the OJT program in Appalachian Tennessee did not conduct follow-up studies of persons who had completed training. The managers of these offices advised us that the follow-up studies had not been made because of the lack of sufficient staff.

The California State Department of Human Resource Development had not developed needed information on the status of trainees who had left the East Bay Skills Center for employment and therefore was unable to review the effectiveness of the training program and to initiate changes where appropriate. Also the State did not provide these former trainees with such follow-up services as additional training and placement services.

The California State department did not prepare summary statistics for each training course or for the Center's overall training program from data received from the follow-up questionnaires obtained from former trainees. The questionnaires therefore did not provide a basis for systematic assessment of the results of program operations.

- - - -

We recommended that the Department of Labor emphasize to the appropriate State agencies their responsibilities for performing follow-up studies of program effectiveness; for obtaining information on the status of former trainees; and, where the need for assistance was indicated, for providing former trainees with follow-up services. The Department of Labor noted the need for follow-up studies as a vital part of the overall manpower training program and took some corrective actions.

PROGRAM PLANNING

Problems relating to program planning have a significant impact on a program's success.

We noted, during our survey of CAMPS in Washington, D.C., California, and Arizona, that it had encountered problems in implementing Executive Order No. 11422 which established the Government's policy of cooperative planning and execution of manpower training programs. Some of the main problems noted were:

- Confusion among participating Federal and non-Federal agencies concerning the specific objectives and functions of CAMPS, particularly the roles of local and area organizations.
- Limited commitment to CAMPS by the participating Federal agencies and limited communication from the headquarters offices of these agencies to their local counterparts.
- Concern at the local level that CAMPS plans had only a limited impact upon the manpower-budgeting decisions of the Federal agencies.

The Department of Labor informed us that CAMPS was revised on May 20, 1971. This revision dealt with the function, terms of reference, committee membership, structure, State-area committee designations, arrangements and relationships, procedures, and other aspects of CAMPS.

The Special Impact program in Los Angeles was an experimental program--contracts were awarded to private firms to provide training and jobs to unemployed or underemployed disadvantaged persons--and was implemented hurriedly without the detailed planning and attention that such an innovative approach generally would require to enhance the chances of its success and to protect the interests of the Government. Although our field review was completed before the contracts for the operation of the program had expired, it was evident that the program in Los Angeles had fallen far short of accomplishing its objectives and that few intended benefits would be obtained for the \$6 million advanced to the contractors.

It was not possible for us to determine whether the unfavorable results of the program were attributable, to a significant extent, to the failure of the Department of Labor to adequately publicize the program and to seek a broad response from potential contractors. It appeared to us, however, that the absence of impartial solicitations of the potential contractors to carry out the program, together with the Department's dependence on an investment banking firm in implementing the program in Los Angeles, was contrary to the Government's best interests. As a result of these conditions, other business and community interests in the Los Angeles area that may have had the capacity and desire to participate in the Special Impact program probably were not given the chance to do so.

At the East Bay Skills Center, there was a low utilization of Center facilities, primarily because of a reduction in MDTA institutional funding for skills centers and because of a failure to provide for use of the facilities for the educational and vocational programs of other organizations. Also the Center's method of funding its training courses was causing delays in initiating follow-on training courses after prior courses had been completed, and the design of the training courses did not readily permit new enrollees to enter into training positions made available through attrition as the courses proceeded.

- - - -

We recommended that:

- The Department of Labor provide for the broad solicitation of prospective Special Impact program contractors in all future instances where such solicitation would enhance the prospects for success of the Federal manpower programs.
- The Department of Labor and HEW make effective use of the excess capacity of the East Bay Skills Center.

With regard to our first recommendation, the Department of Labor noted that the responsibility for administering the Special Impact program had been transferred to OEO and that the Department's sole responsibility for the program

was to monitor and otherwise administer the existing contracts until their termination or completion. The Department stated, however, that recommendations made by us, which were germane to the current status of the program, had been implemented. With regard to our second recommendation, the Departments have taken corrective actions. The Department of Labor told us in December 1971 that new skills center guidelines required the use of open-entry curricula, which has lessened the problems we had cited.

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

Supportive services are directed to increasing the trainees' employability and stability so that they may become fully productive employees.

In designing the JOBS program, the Department recognized that supportive services, such as counseling, job-related basic education, day care, and medical and dental services, were essential if the program was to be effective in bringing disadvantaged persons into the labor force. The failure of certain contractors to provide trainees with supportive services, however, was one of the more significant problems in the contract component of the JOBS program. It is essential that departmental contract negotiators give appropriate consideration to services that contractors can provide in establishing contract requirements.

Training allowances, which are intended as subsistence or incentive payments and which are determined in accordance with enabling program legislation, varied significantly among MDTA, WIN, NYC, and Job Corps programs in the Atlanta area. For example, monthly payments for trainees who had no dependents varied as much as \$100 and for trainees who had three dependents and who were not welfare recipients varied as much as \$145.

Standardization of such allowances is desirable because it would be more equitable for trainees to receive comparable allowances while undergoing similar training and because it should simplify the administration and payment of trainee allowances. We believe that, in the interest of equitable treatment of all trainees and as a matter of consistent Government-wide policy, training allowances under all federally funded training programs should be standardized to the maximum extent practicable.

- - - -

We recommended that the Department of Labor review contractor's activities to ensure that payments are made only for supportive services provided. The Department noted that it was developing more precise program standards which would require that an employer provide all supportive services stipulated in his contract.

Also we recommended to the Congress that it consider amendatory legislation to standardize training allowances payable under federally assisted manpower programs.

MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEMS

The successful management of manpower programs depends, in substantial part, on the timeliness, accuracy, and comprehensiveness of data supplied through the management information system. Such data is needed for evaluating program results and for informing the Congress of accomplishments and other factors relevant to decisionmaking on program design and funding.

In our review of the JOBS program, we noted that reports by the Department of Labor and the National Alliance of Businessmen on results and progress of the JOBS program were not based on reliable data and tended to overstate program accomplishments. Although revisions to the management information system in February 1970 provided for the needed data, we concluded that more effort should be devoted to obtaining compliance, by both contract and noncontract employers, with reporting requirements and to ensuring that data reported by each JOBS employer on job pledges, hirings, terminations, and trainees on board is accurate, is complete, and represents the true status of the JOBS program.

Substantial improvements were needed in the management information system for the WIN program to provide reasonably complete and accurate data on program operations to program managers and to the Congress. Data was not available, at the time of our review, on how long the successful WIN-terminated trainees retained their jobs or whether the savings in AFDC payments continued long enough to allow the WIN program cost to be fully recovered. Data which had been compiled on WIN appeared to us to be generally insufficient either for management purposes or for evaluating program effectiveness. We concluded that substantial efforts needed to be made by the Department of Labor to improve the management information system for WIN.

At four locations at which we made our review, reports of program accomplishments for CEP generally were not as

informative as desirable because the CEP reporting system did not provide accurate data on enrollments, terminations, and placements. For example, our tests of CEP records showed that reports of the number of job placements did not disclose that the placement figures included a significant number of multiple placements of the same person.

- - - -

We recommended that the Department of Labor reexamine the management information systems, to ensure that the systems provide all the data necessary for program management and evaluation and for meaningful, accurate reporting on program operations, costs, and benefits. The Department advised us that it agreed that an effective information system was a critical element in the improvement of program management and performance. In hearings on its 1972 appropriation before an appropriations subcommittee of the House of Representatives on May 24, 1971, the Department said that it was planning a major redesign of its management information systems, a prime feature of which would provide summary information for management at State, regional, and local levels. The Department of Labor told us in December 1971 that the CEP reporting system was changed in 1970 so that multiple placement of the same person, if it occurred, was not included in the reporting.

FISCAL AND FINANCIAL MATTERS

Our reviews identified defects in the adequacy and exercise of controls in significant areas of expenditures. These defects were found principally in procurement and property management, payrolls and allowances, values assigned to non-Federal contributions, and auditing.

Several Job Corps contractors had not established adequate procurement procedures requiring that purchases be made for only what was needed and at the most economical cost. Further most Job Corps contractors had not established controls and procedures for effective property management through inventory systems that would provide for (1) maximum utilization of equipment and supplies, (2) timely transfer or other disposition of equipment and supplies when they became excess to needs, and (3) safeguarding such equipment and supplies against loss through deterioration or improper diversion.

In the JOBS program we noted that erroneous payments to contractors appeared to have been due to misunderstandings of the billing procedures by contractors.

The doubtful financial capability of most Special Impact program contractors in Los Angeles appeared to us to limit the contractors' ability to fulfill their objectives and thus to limit the program's potential for success. The problems involved in expanding existing plant facilities and creating new job opportunities can be severe even for companies with adequate financial capabilities. When the problem of hiring, training, and employing disadvantaged persons is added, the task becomes even more demanding and requires a high degree of capability.

Our review on selected aspects of payments and charges to Job Corps members by OEO showed a need to improve financial controls over Job Corps allowances to avoid improper costs, such as had been incurred by the Government because (1) payments were being made without reduction for the amount of funds previously advanced, (2) procedures did not exist for recovering prior outstanding indebtednesses of terminated corps members later readmitted to the Job Corps, (3) procedures were not being implemented to recover unused

transportation and meal tickets from terminated corps members, and (4) absent-without-leave time, for which corps members were not entitled to allowances, was not being properly reported.

At the East Bay Skills Center, many trainees were paid training allowances for unexcused absences, contrary to the intent of MDTA and to Department of Labor directives. The Center's payment of allowances for such absences does not contribute to trainees' developing good work habits or becoming aware of the requirements in the world of work.

Our review of payroll procedures at nine NYC locations showed that, at each of the locations, one or more of the functional steps that make up the system of internal control either were not being taken or were being taken in a manner that did not provide reasonable safeguards against payroll irregularities or other forms of unauthorized expenditures.

In the OJT program in Appalachian Tennessee, we noted a number of instances in which employers were paid for a full training period for enrollees who had not completed the training or were paid for training the same person under two subcontracts at the same time.

We noted weaknesses in the control over, and the accounting for, Federal funds of NYC activities in Los Angeles County. We found that the records maintained by several of the subsponsors in support of the reimbursements for employees working less than full time on NYC programs did not provide support adequate for showing that the services had been performed. We noted also a need for improved internal controls essential to securing accuracy and dependability in payroll data and to minimizing the possibility of fraud.

We could not determine whether the reported non-Federal contributions to the NYC program were reasonably accurate or fairly evaluated because the documentation supporting the contributions generally was inadequate and because the valuations generally were based on noncurrent data. We believe that more timely and increased audit effort would have resulted in earlier identification and correction of these weaknesses.

- - - -

We recommended that the Department of Labor and/or OEO

- review the implementation of the revised attendance procedures at the East Bay Skills Center,
- improve internal controls concerning payroll data,
- emphasize to NYC sponsors and subsponsors the need to more clearly identify the documentation supporting non-Federal contributions,
- revise its billing instructions, and
- evaluate prospective contractors' financial capabilities to fulfill contractual commitments.

We recommended also that the Department of Labor and OEO give particular attention to strengthening the execution of audit functions by providing for more frequent and comprehensive audits. The Department of Labor and OEO have taken actions to implement our recommendations. The Department of Labor told us in December 1971 that assistance was available to help contractors with billing procedures.

CHAPTER 4

OVERALL OBSERVATIONS

Our reviews of manpower programs generally did not cover all aspects of a program's operations or most program locations, because of the large number and diverse nature of Federal manpower programs. Our conclusions and recommendations, however, were not based solely on our field review work. In addition to making our reviews, we gave careful consideration to the overall intent and impact of programs as determined through (1) examinations into the legislative histories of programs, (2) reports on reviews of the programs by departmental consultants, and (3) discussions with Federal and State officials, community representatives, program participants, and manpower experts. Through these approaches we gained certain overall impressions about several aspects of manpower training, which, we believe, warrant consideration in formulating programs and evaluating their results.

HOW TO MEASURE SUCCESS OF PROGRAMS

We stated in our March 1969 summary report on antipov-erty programs that the programs dealt with such intangible concepts as the social levels of disadvantaged persons and were subject to conditions which were not amenable to reliable, and in some cases not amenable to any, quantitative measurement.

We stated also that:

- Criteria were lacking by which to determine at what level of accomplishment a program was considered successful.
- Data of the large volume and variety necessary to ascertain program results either was not available or was not reliable.
- Program accomplishments might not be fully perceptible within a relatively short time frame.

--Other Federal, State, local, and private programs aimed at helping the poor and changes in local conditions, such as declining labor demands due to economic conditions, wage scales, and local attitudes, had had their effect upon the same persons who had received assistance under the manpower programs.

Although the Department of Labor is working to improve its management information system and thus provide evaluators with more reliable quantitative data, a problem still will remain in attempting to ascertain at what point--using measurable data--programs are successful or effective. It appears that subjective judgments by those charged with making program policy still will be required to establish quantitative criteria or goals. Moreover to the extent that criteria and goals either are not clear-cut or are not fully endorsed by all of those connected with the programs, it may be desirable, in setting manpower program strategy, to obtain the views of community leaders; employers; and program participants, as well as program operators.

Because subjective judgment will continue to be a significant part of program direction and evaluation, determining the degree of program success will be a difficult task, and the results of such determinations will tend to cause some controversy. We believe, however, that evaluations, despite their potentially limited capabilities, are of value to program decisionmakers and should continue to be made.

PROLIFERATION OF MANPOWER TRAINING PROGRAMS

There has been a proliferation of manpower training programs--establishing new training programs without abolishing the old ones--many of them specifically authorized in legislation and having their own funding source and eligibility requirements. Such a proliferation of specific programs has built in rigidities that frustrate efforts to allocate limited resources. Although each program is supposed to serve a distinct client group, many persons in need of training could qualify under several programs because of the often broad guidelines on eligibility. This creates a problem for the individual, because he probably is not familiar enough with any of the programs to decide which is best suited to his needs and therefore the program intake

personnel make that decision for him. According to the Department of Labor, there is an overriding concern with filling available slots for a particular program rather than with developing the mix of services that the person needs to become a productive member of the work force and that the community requires to cope with local problems.

Accompanying the proliferation of programs has been duplication of administrative systems for the delivery of manpower services. Some programs are operated by public agencies, others by nonprofit private organizations, and still others by profitmaking companies. The Department of Labor has delivery systems involving the State employment services, Community Action Agencies, vocational education agencies, self-help organizations like the Opportunities Industrialization Centers, and a number of others.

Although some competition is healthy and desirable, the duplication or overlapping of services and agency responsibilities can become counterproductive. At the local level there usually is no single agency or combination of a few easily accessible institutions where those seeking help can find it. For example, in one large eastern city there were 18 different organizations involved in job development and placement activities.

It should be noted, however, that the Comprehensive Work and Training Program established by 1967 EOA amendments was a mechanism for a comprehensive approach to, with maximum opportunities for local initiative in, developing programs that would respond to local needs and problems. This program was to provide a systematic approach to planning and implementation, including linkage of relevant component programs authorized by EOA with one another and with other appropriate public and private programs. The Comprehensive Work and Training Program has not been implemented, primarily because funds have not been appropriated for it.

IMPACT OF THE ECONOMY

During periods of high or increasing unemployment, manpower training programs are not too successful in achieving their main objective--placing persons in jobs utilizing their new skills--because the overabundance of unemployed

trained workers offsets the benefits to the employers in hiring the disadvantaged. Although we found this to be a problem in most programs, the JOBS program illustrated this dilemma rather well. It helped the disadvantaged to obtain meaningful employment creditably well during periods of high or rising employment but not during periods of high or increasing unemployment.

A basic concept of the JOBS program is that it is in the public interest to increase the supply of trained labor by reimbursing private business organizations for the cost of hiring, training, and retaining disadvantaged persons whom they otherwise would not hire. A major problem with this concept is that the successful placement of such persons depends on employers' needs for more workers. If employers are experiencing cutbacks in their operations and a part of their regular work force is on furlough or if well-qualified persons who need no further training are available for whatever job openings exist, it becomes increasingly difficult to interest such employers in hiring relatively untrained disadvantaged persons, even with a subsidy to cover the employers' added cost of training.

The JOBS program, like most manpower programs, is not a job-creation program and ordinarily it does not increase the number of existing job openings; therefore, even during periods of relatively stable labor demand, for an employer to participate in a manpower program, such as the JOBS program, he would have to give preference to disadvantaged persons over persons he normally would hire in filling job openings. When this happens the program appears simply to shift the burden of unemployment from disadvantaged persons to others. Although this is a problem, its impact is somewhat diminished because those to whom the burden is shifted are probably better able to compete for jobs than are the disadvantaged.

A major new program to create temporary jobs which would lead to permanent jobs was initiated in July 1971 when the President signed the Emergency Employment Act authorizing the Public Employment Program. The program was formulated to try to alleviate the high and rising unemployment rate that began in the latter part of 1970. The program is expected to provide employment for about 150,000 unemployed

and underemployed persons in public service jobs at the State and local levels at a cost of \$1 billion in fiscal year 1972. The act provides that the Secretary of Labor not utilize more than 15 percent of the funds for the purpose of providing training and manpower services for the persons employed under the program. Thus the bulk of the funds allocated to State and local governments is to be used for the wages and salaries of the participants.

PROGRAMS HAVE LIMITED IMPACT IN RURAL AREAS

Manpower training programs face limited chances for success in rural areas where job opportunities are limited and where there is a general lack of economic growth.

The lack of job opportunities in some rural areas has caused many trained persons to outmigrate to urban areas to seek work. To the extent that these persons are successful in obtaining work in urban areas, particularly in training-related work, their participation in a manpower program has been beneficial to them. Also the outmigration of trained persons may be of some benefit to the remaining residents of the rural area in that there is less competition for the jobs that are available. We believe, however, that continued outmigration of trained persons, particularly if these are the younger and the talented individuals of the area, does little for the economic development of the rural areas and, in the long run, further compounds the problems faced by the areas in their efforts to achieve lasting economic improvement through the establishment of a stable, diversified economy and skilled work force.

Federal manpower training programs, by themselves, convey certain tangible and intangible benefits to the program participants by increasing their basic educational and occupational skills, providing them with temporary income, and bolstering their self-respect. In rural areas, however, the program accomplishments will be severely limited unless such programs are accompanied by strong Federal, State, and local action which will attract new industry or otherwise create new job opportunities.

Creating a significant number of new private-sector jobs in rural areas has been the goal of a number of Federal

programs in the last decade. These programs have shown some progress, but much remains to be done. As an interim measure, perhaps the use of Federal programs which create jobs, such as Operation Mainstream or programs of the Emergency Employment Act, would offer temporary alleviation of the problem of unemployment until more permanent programs can take effect.

The Congress has continued to recognize the need for economic development in rural areas. A number of bills have been introduced in the Ninety-second Congress to revitalize rural areas through developing jobs for residents within rural areas and offering incentives to businesses to attract industry to rural areas.

It appears that, even if new legislation is enacted, achieving the objectives for a revitalized rural America will take many years of coordinated effort by the State and Federal Governments and will require the cooperation of the private sector. Perhaps the use of demonstration projects, coupling public and private economic development and manpower programs, will offer new approaches not only for solving these problems but also for attaining the objectives at an earlier date.

GAO REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS

ON CIVIL AGENCY MANPOWER PROGRAMS

JANUARY 1969 THROUGH JANUARY 1972

1. Review of Certain Aspects of the Administration of the Neighborhood Youth Corps Program in Los Angeles, California (B-165214, Jan. 7, 1969).
2. Review of Economic Opportunity Programs¹ (B-130515, Mar. 18, 1969).
3. The Special Impact Program in Los Angeles Is Not Meeting Goal of Providing Jobs for the Disadvantaged (B-168560, Oct. 7, 1970).
4. Need to Enhance the Effectiveness of On-The-Job Training in Appalachian Tennessee (B-146879, Nov. 13, 1970).
5. Opportunities for Improving Training Results and Efficiency at the East Bay Skills Center, Oakland, California Under the Manpower Development and Training Act (B-146879, Feb. 10, 1971).
6. Evaluation of Results and Administration of the Job Opportunities in the Business Sector Program in Five Cities (B-163922, Mar. 24, 1971).
7. Problems in Accomplishing Objectives of the Work Incentive Program (B-164031(3), Sept. 24, 1971).
8. Opportunities for Improving Federally Assisted Manpower Programs Identified as Result of Review in the Atlanta, Georgia, Area (B-146879, Jan. 7, 1972).

¹ Summary report on Economic Opportunity programs. The 54 supplementary reports to the Congress have not been listed.

APPENDIX II

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR STAFFING FOR MANPOWER PROGRAMS

The Department's Manpower Administration is responsible for the direction, coordination, and support of manpower programs and operations. Most of the day-to-day operations are carried out at 10 Regional Manpower Administration offices which plan and provide for the operation of manpower programs in the regions in partnership with State, local, and private organizations. Regional offices are located in Boston, Massachusetts; New York, N.Y.; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Atlanta, Georgia; Chicago, Illinois; Dallas, Texas; Kansas City, Missouri; Denver, Colorado; San Francisco, California; and Seattle, Washington.

The Department of Labor furnished us with the following information relating to Manpower Administration staffing.

Personnel, by Grades, as of September 30, 1971
Manpower Administration

| <u>Grade</u> | <u>Headquarters</u> | <u>Regions</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|----------------|---------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Level IV | 1 | - | 1 |
| Level V | 1 | - | 1 |
| GS-18 | 5 | - | 5 |
| " 17 | 9 | 4 | 13 |
| " 16 | 25 | 1 | 26 |
| " 15 | 170 | 115 | 285 |
| " 14 | 256 | 238 | 494 |
| " 13 | 329 | 431 | 760 |
| " 12 | 212 | 461 | 673 |
| " 11 | 127 | 189 | 316 |
| " 10 and below | <u>881</u> | <u>1,228</u> | <u>2,109</u> |
| Total | <u>2,016</u> | <u>2,667</u> | <u>4,683</u> |

Personnel, by Organization, as of September 30, 1971
 Manpower Administration

| <u>Organization</u> | <u>Positions</u> |
|--|------------------|
| Office of Assistant Secretary for Manpower and Manpower Administrator | 187 |
| Office of Information | 40 |
| Office of Financial Management Information Systems | 360 |
| Office of Management and Administrative Systems | 198 |
| Office of Policy, Evaluation, and Research | 221 |
| Unemployment Insurance Service | 202 |
| Office of Public Service Employment | 29 |
| Job Corps | 175 |
| Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training | 50 |
| U.S. Training and Employment Service | <u>554</u> |
| Total headquarters | 2,016 |
| Regional Manpower Administration offices | 1,749 |
| Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training--regions | 391 |
| District of Columbia Manpower Administration | 402 |
| Veterans Employment Service--field | <u>125</u> |
| Total regions | <u>2,667</u> |
| Total | <u>4,683</u> |

APPENDIX III

FUNDING AND ENROLLMENT OPPORTUNITIES
OF FEDERAL MANPOWER PROGRAMS

| Category | Estimated fiscal year 1972 | |
|---|----------------------------|------------------------|
| | Enrollment opportunities | Obligations (millions) |
| PRIVATE SECTOR ON-THE-JOB TRAINING: | | |
| JOBS program | 76,900 | \$ 200.0 |
| JOBS optional program | 40,000 | 40.0 |
| National OJT program | 20,000 | 20.0 |
| OJT program services | - | .5 |
| PUBLIC SECTOR ON-THE-JOB TRAINING--PUBLIC SERVICE CAREERS PROGRAM | 66,800 | 125.8 |
| EMERGENCY EMPLOYMENT ACT | 150,000 | 1,000.0 |
| INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING UNDER MDTA | 146,600 | 324.8 |
| JOB CORPS | 26,200 | 197.2 |
| IN-SCHOOL WORK SUPPORT: | | |
| NYC in-school program | 94,700 | 69.8 |
| NYC summer program | 414,200 | 165.7 |
| POSTSCHOOL WORK SUPPORT: | | |
| NYC out-of-school program | 36,800 | 127.0 |
| Operation Mainstream | 12,100 | 38.8 |
| SPECIAL TARGETING--CEP | - | 172.8 |
| COMPUTERIZED JOB PLACEMENT | - | 22.3 |
| WIN PROGRAM | 160,000 | 197.1 |
| SPECIAL IMPACT PROGRAM (OEO) | - | 25.8 |
| OPPORTUNITIES INDUSTRIALIZATION CENTERS (OEO, HEW) (note a) | 30,000 | 13.0 |
| FEDERAL-STATE EMPLOYMENT SERVICE--EMPLOYMENT SERVICES (Department of Labor) | - | 395.0 |
| PROGRAM SUPPORT (Department of Labor): | | |
| Manpower training services | - | 61.7 |
| Manpower Administration--salaries and expenses | - | 89.7 |
| Total | <u>1,275,027</u> | <u>\$3,287.0</u> |

^aAlso received \$20 million of Department of Labor funds for MDTA institutional training.

PRINCIPAL OFFICIALS
RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ADMINISTRATION
OF ACTIVITIES DISCUSSED IN THIS REPORT

| | Tenure of office | |
|--|------------------|-----------|
| | From | To |
| <u>DEPARTMENT OF LABOR</u> | | |
| SECRETARY OF LABOR: | | |
| James D. Hodgson | July 1970 | Present |
| George P. Shultz | Jan. 1969 | June 1970 |
| W. Willard Wirtz | Sept. 1962 | Jan. 1969 |
| ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR MANPOWER: | | |
| Malcolm R. Lovell, Jr. | July 1970 | Present |
| Arnold R. Weber | Feb. 1969 | July 1970 |
| Stanley H. Ruttenberg | June 1966 | Jan. 1969 |
| MANPOWER ADMINISTRATOR: | | |
| Paul J. Fasser, Jr. | Oct. 1970 | Present |
| Malcolm R. Lovell, Jr. | June 1969 | Oct. 1970 |
| J. Nicholas Peet | Feb. 1969 | June 1969 |
| William Kolberg (acting) | Jan. 1969 | Feb. 1969 |
| Stanley H. Ruttenberg | Jan. 1965 | Jan. 1969 |
| <u>DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE</u> | | |
| SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE: | | |
| Elliot L. Richardson | June 1970 | Present |
| Robert H. Finch | Jan. 1969 | June 1970 |
| Wilbur J. Cohen | Mar. 1968 | Jan. 1969 |
| ADMINISTRATOR, SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICE: | | |
| John D. Twiname | Mar. 1970 | Present |
| Mary E. Switzer | Aug. 1967 | Mar. 1970 |

APPENDIX IV

| <u>Tenure of Office</u> | |
|-------------------------|-----------|
| <u>From</u> | <u>To</u> |

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
(continued)

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION:

| | | |
|----------------------------|-----------|-----------|
| Sidney P. Marland, Jr. | Dec. 1970 | Present |
| Terrel H. Bell (acting) | June 1970 | Dec. 1970 |
| James E. Allen, Jr. | May 1969 | June 1970 |
| Peter P. Muirhead (acting) | Jan. 1969 | May 1969 |
| Harold Howe II | Jan. 1966 | Dec. 1968 |

OFFICE OF ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY

DIRECTOR:

| | | |
|------------------------------|------------|------------|
| Philip V. Sanchez | Sept. 1971 | Present |
| Frank C. Carlucci | Dec. 1970 | Sept. 1971 |
| Donald Rumsfeld | May 1969 | Dec. 1970 |
| Bertrand M. Harding (acting) | Mar. 1968 | May 1969 |

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR COMMUNITY
ACTION PROGRAMS (note a):

| | | |
|-------------------|-----------|------------|
| Theodore M. Berry | Apr. 1965 | Sept. 1969 |
|-------------------|-----------|------------|

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR FOR PROGRAM
DEVELOPMENT:

| | | |
|---------------------------|------------|-----------|
| Carol M. Khosrovi | July 1971 | Present |
| Alfred H. Taylor (acting) | June 1971 | July 1971 |
| Joseph P. Maldonado | Aug. 1970 | June 1971 |
| Marvin J. Feldman | Jan. 1970 | Aug. 1970 |
| Robert Perrin (acting) | Sept. 1969 | Jan. 1970 |

^aIn September 1969, this position was terminated as an organizational entity and responsibility for the Special Impact program was transferred to the Office of Program Development.